

The Republican.

No. 6. Vol. VI.] LONDON, FRIDAY, July 5, 1822. [PRICE 6d.

TO THE REPUBLICANS OF THE ISLAND OF GREAT BRITAIN.

Dorchester Gaol, June 30,

CITIZENS,

Year 3, of the Spanish Revolution.

In the last No. of the last volume of the Republican I addressed to you my ideas upon the right of property, and to the best of my ability stated to you where I considered that right did belong and where it did not. A friend, a sincere friend I believe of mine and yours, has thought proper to call in question some of my opinions upon that subject, and by some strong arguments and a powerful stile of reasoning has attacked them in the spirit of free discussion. As free discussion is the first feature in our principles, I am sure I shall give you satisfaction and do justice to my friend by giving insertion to his sentiments; and as far as I cannot fully and fairly reply to him, I acknowledge myself a convert.

TO MR. R. CARLILE, DORCHESTER GAOL.

SIR,

I READ with the greatest pleasure, and with the strongest concurrence, the great principles relative to human happiness which are so courageously maintained in your Republican. Keeping the same end in view as yourself, the greatest happiness of the greatest number, I feel persuaded that this can only be attained by the diffusion of knowledge, the thorough extirpation of Priestcraft, and the establishment of a pure Representative System. But my wish for the acquisition of this glorious object makes me the more anxious that those who pursue it should guard themselves from mixing up with it other topics which may render the public mind even more averse to these doctrines than it unfortunately is at present.

What I particularly allude to is a letter of yours, in the last Number of the Fifth Volume of your Republican, which contains some observations on the subject of property, calculated, in my opinion,

Printed and Published by R. CARLILE, 55, Fleet-street.

rather to injure than to promote the great cause of good government. I am persuaded that one very powerful cause, why the middling classes in this country feel disinclined to any Reformation in the Government, is because our present Aristocracy have found means to implant in them a vague apprehension that no property can possibly be secure if such an event were to take place. As one cannot wonder that any man thus alarmed should cling to the present system, however bad he may think it—so I am sure you will agree with me, that all the language, which the advocates of good government hold about property, ought to be peculiarly cautious and well defined, in order to dispel, if possible, the groundless alarm which its enemies have so industriously diffused.

The foundation of all property, as well as of all other regulations, such as they ought to be, is the good of the society. To secure the greatest possible happiness on the whole, it is desirable that every man should enjoy as large a portion as can be of the fruits of his own labour.

It is highly beneficial, both to themselves and to every one else, that men should be induced to lay by some of the fruits of their labour, and not to consume all immediately. The produce thus laid by and accumulated constitutes what is called capital, and the accumulations, made by one man, afford the means of assisting and putting in action the labour of many others, who may not have been equally frugal or fortunate. We see, by unhappy experience, that a poor man who cannot obtain employment, that is, who cannot get some one with property already accumulated, to give him materials for work, as well as food and clothes, is in a state of perfect destitution. Unless therefore some accumulate, the rest, who do not accumulate cannot subsist; and no one will accumulate unless his savings are secure to him, and unless the power of bequeathing them to whomsoever he likes is secured to him. It is therefore most highly beneficial, and that too most especially for the poor, that the accumulations of a man should be protected both to himself and to his descendants. In other words, that the large masses of wealth should be respected just as much as the small.

The observance of contracts is another regulation equally indispensable to the happiness of society, essential both to the security and to the accumulation of property. And these are what you call the grand moral rights to property, that is, the grand rules for measuring out and apportioning the exclusive rights of an individual, which rules have been adopted as most conducive to the happiness of the society, that happiness being the foundation and measure of all right whatever.

So far I am persuaded you will agree with me. Now comes the point of our difference.

The true and legitimate end of Government is the enforcement of these rules for the benefit of the community. But it happens, that a Club of Priests and Aristocrats have in our case monopolized the powers of Government without any responsibility to the people, and

they have passed and enforced a great number of very bad laws. They have decreed away one-tenth of the produce of the country to the priests; taxed the people most oppressively, for sinecure places; entered into a most unjust war, and contracted a large debt to support it. Is it just, or is it good for the happiness of the people, that these bad regulations, originally contracted by an abuse of the powers of Government, should be confirmed and sanctioned when the powers of Government are transferred to those who will employ them as they ought to be employed?

Now I entirely concur with what you say on the subject of tithes to the Church. To call tithes the property of the Church is altogether nonsensical, and an abuse of language. They are a tax levied for the support of a particular class of servants, and given to them conditionally upon the performance of a certain office. If it had pleased the Parliament to give the tithes of the country to any other set of gentlemen in black, on condition of their distributing poison and promulgating ghost stories about the country, this reverend host might just as well have said, that their tithes were their property. Priests have no more property in tithes than any other officers of Government have in taxes. I should, therefore, abolish the office altogether, and without delay; but I should still think it both wise and just to give pensions to the present incumbents. In the same manner I think a standing army an instrument of misrule and oppression, and as such I should, if I had the power, disband it instantly; but I should still think that justice required me to pension off the soldiers. I abominate the functions of a priest and of a soldier as much as you can do, but I must still consider that those who execute these functions are human beings, that their expectations have been raised, and their labour bestowed, on what have been hitherto viewed as useful and honourable employments, and that to reduce these classes of persons to sudden and unforeseen poverty would provoke the sympathies of mankind in their favour, and create a greater opposition even to the abolition of the office itself. When the office itself has been abolished, and security attained for the cessation of all the burden entailed by it in a short period, I think it is a less evil to pay the present holders some pension during their lives, than to turn them out naked upon the highways. Compare the two together, and I think you will not fail to perceive that the latter will cause by far the greater mass of unhappiness.

But the case of the fundholder is most essentially distinguished from that of the priest. A man acquires property by labour and saving; he lends it to government, who contract to pay him a certain annual interest. Here the property has been first accumulated by honest toil, and then voluntarily transferred upon the faith of a contract. Now surely if other contracts ought to be observed, this ought to be so too. If I lend a private individual some money, and take his note of hand, What is my security for repayment? Nothing but my confidence that the Government, or the law which it makes, will enforce the observance of this contract. But if contracts are

once to be violated, this security utterly vanishes, and the same measure which breaks a contract between the Government and its lender, will also break the contract between every lender and borrower.

You will tell me that the Government is a corrupt one, and has borrowed this money for an unjust war. In this I perfectly agree: but still, while it continues to be the existing Government, every one does and must act upon the regulations which it makes. There is really nothing else upon which a man *can* rely; and, as I said before, I have no other reason for feeling secure of receiving payment for a private debt, except that the Government has made a regulation that I shall be entitled to receive it. I, and you, and every one else, must rely upon the laws made by this Government, bad as it is: We cannot help acting upon them every hour of our lives, and if any one tells us that they are not to be obeyed, we have no security either for person or property remaining. Surely, therefore, the man who lends money to Government ought not to suffer for having done what every one else does and must do constantly, that is, for relying upon the acts and regulations of the Government. The Government may make a contract for a bad purpose, just as they may make any other bad law. But when a law is passed, be it bad or good, every body does act upon it, and must act upon it, while it is a law, and it would be highly unjust to punish any one for doing so. It is surely no less unjust to punish the fundholder for having trusted to the promise, and acted upon the regulations of the Government; and to withhold the payment of the debt would be to order the severest of all punishments to him.

Pray keep in mind, that I urge not one word in vindication of the government and its acts. No one can entertain a more genuine and fervid detestation of it than I do. But there is a great difference between thinking a government corrupt—and wishing to see a certain number of individuals severely punished for having merely acted upon the existing regulations of that government. I am most anxious to impress upon you that when you say,—“Our government is bad and therefore its regulations are not to be relied upon, nor its promises to be kept.” You entirely annihilate all security for property and rights of every kind. For no man knows what he can call his own, except from these very laws, which you are proclaiming to be unworthy of trust or observance. Proclaim as loudly as possible, and I will join you with all my heart and voice, the incurable badness of the government, and the necessity of establishing a better: But do not let us proscribe or punish men for having acted upon the regulations of this government while it existed, and while there was no other standard for the dealings between man and man except its regulations. You would not think it just to inflict whipping or imprisonment on a man for having lent money to government in support of what government decreed to be just: Why then would you inflict upon him a much severer punishment, by forfeiting his contract and ruining him?

All this reasoning will be greatly strengthened in its effect if you consider who the fundholders are. The funds are now in the hands of persons very different from the original lenders. By far the greatest number of those who hold them, are really poor men, who by unceasing toil and self-privation have been laying by a sum to support them in the decline of life—helpless widows or single women, whose small pittances are all embarked upon this government security. Of this I can not only assure you as a fact within my own knowledge, attested by the books at the Bank of England which any body may consult—but a little consideration will shew you that the fact must be so. A poor artizan or manufacturer, who is saving his twenty, thirty, or fifty pounds a year for the maintenance of his old age, is positively obliged to embark it in the funds, because he can find no other security to place it in, so as to make any interest by it. The case is similar with a poor widow or a single woman, who has neither opportunity nor skill to search about for any other mode of investment. I know myself instances of many persons, whose whole support, the result of years of saving and self-denial, is vested in the funds—persons who have their whole income of fifty to one hundred or one hundred and fifty pounds per annum, derived altogether from this source. I have no doubt that you take the fundholders to be rich men, as I knew that many others mistake them to be. The original lenders might have been so—but a rich man very seldom holds property in the funds. He generally buys land or houses, or looks out for private individuals to lend his money to, by which he can commonly obtain a larger interest than the funds afford. A poor man who is laying by a little and little every year, cannot do this—still less can a woman. The consequence is that by not paying the funds, you would scarcely touch the rich at all, while you would frustrate the effect of years of saving and self-denial to the poor, and reduce to starvation the most helpless people in the community.

Only look for example, at the case of the Savings Bank. This is a part of the National Debt, and consists exclusively of the little savings of labourers, made week after week. The only difference between the Saving Banks and any other part of the National Debt, is, that in the former a poor man has greater facilities of investing his money—may do it by smaller sums and at more convenient places—and receives a little larger interest. If there had been no Saving Banks, *these very same men* would have put their little hoards all into the funds. Now surely you would not for an instant think of refusing payment of these: Nor consequently ought you to refuse payment of those funds of which they merely form a part.

But farther, by not paying the funds, you would not merely spare the rich and shockingly wound the poor, but you would actually do the very thing of all others which the rich are the most anxious to do. You call the funds the debt of the Aristocracy: Do you think that the Aristocracy, who have been the contractors of it, have the smallest desire to pay it? Be assured that they have not. The

great landlords, who actually voted all the loans, are the most ardently bent upon cheating those, whose only crime has been a reliance on their votes. By advocating the non-payment of the debt, you are efficaciously, though unconsciously, furthering their views. It is nothing but fear which prevents them from realising this object without delay. And you are now unknowingly assisting the great and powerful enemies of all amendment in the government, in their scheme for defrauding a numerous branch of the poorer classes, from whom all hope of effecting a Reform must be derived.

I trust that I have said enough to shew, that justice, compassion, and expediency, all concur in enjoining the payment of the National Debt: justice, because the fundholder has merely relied upon the existing laws in investing his savings, upon which every body does and must rely, while the government exists, and which form the sole security and standard for rights and property of every kind. Compassion on account of the poverty and helplessness of the persons whom such an act would strip, which would really raise all the sympathies of mankind against us and our cause. Expediency, because all hope of ameliorating the government at all must be derived from the middling and the poorer classes, and the fear of such irremediable ruin to be inflicted upon numbers of these classes, could not fail to make them cling to the existing system, and would most indisputably prevent them from forming that intense and unanimous wish for a good government which can alone ensure its accomplishment.

I hope you will do me the favour to peruse these remarks with attention, as they come from one who most heartily coincides with all your views both as to Republicanism and Religion, and who is extremely anxious that no erroneous views on the subject of property should intervene to frustrate the success of these magnificent and most beneficial proposals. The propositions which I beg you to consider with attention, are briefly these: The foundation of all property is the need of its establishment for the happiness of the community; one of the most essential regulations for securing all property, is the enforcement of contracts; all contracts are regulated and enforced by the existing government, and if you say that contracts made by this government are not to be observed, no individual can possibly know what to call his own. Though, therefore, I desire most ardently to have the government amended, so as to be secure against its making bad contracts for the future; yet, I cannot think it just to punish any class of individuals for merely relying on the regulations which every one without exception must rely upon, and I think that such a measure cannot be adopted without taking away all security whatever for the rights of any individual. Requesting you to weigh these observations with care,

I remain your very sincere well-wisher,

ANDREW MIDDLETON,

I should first observe that Andrew Middleton is an assumed and not a real name; and *I beg here* to observe like-

wise, that I could not be guilty of publishing the name of a friend against his consent, though, I am informed, some fears exist upon that head in different quarters, I never was guilty of any thing of the kind where I was requested not to do it, and any correspondent shall find that his confidence in me shall never be abused. He has only to say that it does not suit him to have his name published, to have his wish respected. I have every reason to think that my letters and correspondences are as sacred and respected here as if I were in my house in Fleet Street, London, which I am sorry to say is still held by the most dishonest of tenants, who will not allow me to use it, but leaves me to pay the rent!

The first and most important point for notice in the foregoing letter, is the inference drawn from the writer's arguments, that, the people of this country are in duty bound, as moral and honest people, to pay the whole of what is called the National Debt. I perfectly agree with what the writer says as to the persons to whom this debt is asserted to be due; and I as cordially concur with him in paying that debt to a certain extent, or as far as it is possible to do it justly. Justice is due to all, and to me it appears a greater piece of injustice to tax the future produce of the industry of the country to pay either interest or principal of this debt, than to make the present creditor be content with a compound from what is considered public property. Necessity has no law, but is itself a law of nature not to be resisted, and before the writer of the foregoing letter had argued for the moral necessity of paying this debt, he should have shewn its practicability. If I by any accidental circumstances, or from design, incur a debt that I have no possibility of paying, there is a law to relieve me from that debt; but then that law, whilst it compels me to give up all my present property, does not compel me to pledge the future produce of my industry. If I give up all my present property, the law compels my creditors to compound, or to forfeit their claim upon me, and if this be just to an individual, it would be just to any association of individuals, and the only point to be considered is who are the debtors and what is their property. The only just power to decide this point appears to me to be a National Representation: by the decision of the Representatives of the Nation all are in moral duty bound to abide. Upon this point the whole argument centers, and I think the existing laws between creditor and debtor are fairly applicable to every case of debt in the country, where those laws are enforced; because, those laws

have existed while that debt has been accumulating, and there has been a sort of general apprehension that a time must arrive when the debt incurred by the government must be either compounded or commuted. So far I consider that the law or the government of the country, which is supposed to emanate from the law, is on my side; and the justice of pensioning or not pensioning the present army of Priests and Soldiers is a question which a National Convention can be alone competent to decide.

I shall recur to this subject next week, as I shall be better able to judge of my friendly opponent's arguments after I have seen them in print and have time to reflect upon them a few days.

R. CARLILE.

TO MR. R. CARLILE, DORCHESTER GAOL.

SIR,

Edinburgh, June 25, in the Year
1822, of the Carpenter's Wife's Son.

It is exactly three months this day since I wrote to you before, but I hope that you will excuse me when I assure you, that it was from want of time, and not from want of inclination, that kept me from writing long ere this time.

I have again the pleasure of remitting to you the sum of Four Pounds, which was left with, or sent to me, in the following various sums, as subscriptions towards your fines, all of which you will acknowledge in the Republican.

	£.	s.	d.		£.	s.	d.
A Female Friend to Truth in Irvine	1	1	0	A sincere Christian, who de- test and abhors the opi- nions propagated by			
For Richard Carlile	1	0	0	Richard Carlile; but who			
J. H., a liberal Christian	0	1	0	is no less an Enemy to			
James Kinloch	0	1	0	Persecution, knowing that			
A determined foe to Tyrants	0	5	0	his Lord and Saviour Je-			
Reason guides me	0	3	0	sus Christ was Persecuted	0	10	6
An Enemy to all Persecution	0	2	6	A Deist who dares not avow			
A liberal Christian	0	2	6	his Principles	0	10	6
Logic	0	3	0				

A letter enclosing the one pound note, as marked above, "For Richard Carlile," was left at my shop by a Gentleman's servant, and the words already stated were all that was on it. If Gentlemen who are enemies to persecution would follow the above example, they would then prove themselves the secret friends of Civil and Religious Liberty; though, perhaps circumstances at the time, prevented them from making their names public.

The person who gave the half guinea, and subscribes himself, "A

sincere Christian, &c." is a Gentleman of the first respectability, and an amiable character indeed; it is a pity that he, like all the other Christian mythologists, is so far lost in the labyrinth of such heterogenous doctrines. Time will only permit me at present to say a very few words on that subject. Christians in general, when speaking of their system, seem to forget one part as they endeavour to explain another. Was it not according to the grand plan formed in the councils of heaven, that this same Jesus Christ should come to this world to be persecuted, to be vilified and despised, and at last be put to an ignominious death, by the very people he was sent to Reform; yet, these inconsistent Christians pretend to say, that he was persecuted, and at the same time they tell us that Jehovah and this same Jesus, planned the whole proceedings and end of his life. If this *incarnate God* had not come to this world to suffer and die for degenerate mankind, the Christians tell us, that they would all have inevitably perished, therefore his sufferings and death should not, by Christians, be called persecution. And the very people who were the instruments of his sufferings and death the Christians believe to have been ordained by God, and this wise Son of his, for that very purpose, and if Judas Iscariot, and some other persons had not acted exactly as they did, the grand plan would not have been accomplished, and poor forlorn Jesus would probably have yet been wandering on the earth, without doing any thing to avert the bloody vengeance of his vindictive father. Thus then, Judas Iscariot, and those who acted as his accomplices, were as necessary as agents in the grand plan of salvation as was Jesus Christ himself; because, either they or some other persons, must have acted the part they did, or else Jesus would have been under the necessity of taking away his own life, or persuading his father to do it, as it is said, nothing less than a bloody sacrifice would satisfy them.

From what we know of the Christian priests, and worshippers of Jesus, we may be convinced, that though the Deity was to change his mind (as he has done before) and beget a daughter, and send her with a new mission to alter the present system of worship, though that alteration was much less than the change from Judaism to Christianity; these well fed, well beneficed, and well paid clergymen, and their interested supporters, would act in a similar manner to the Jewish priests of old, and put to death this lovely female God for her temerity. The reason is obvious, as they, like the Jewish priests, would not believe that their wise and all-knowing God would have any occasion to improve upon his former plans, but if this female and incarnate Deity and her party were to gain the ascendancy, how would our sleek-headed, big-bellied men of God, like the odious name of persecutors of the daughter of God, and such is the epithet they unsparingly bestow upon the Jewish priests and their supporters, for their usage of the Christian God, although they considered him nothing less than an impostor.

With my most sincere and best wishes, for you, and your heroic Wife, and Sister, not forgetting your young family,

Consider me, dear Sir, your faithful friend,

J. AFFLECK

TO MR. JAMES AFFLECK, EDINBURGH.

Dorchester Goal, June 30, Year 1822,
of the Carpenter's Wife's Son.

DEAR SIR,

IN again having to acknowledge a remittance from Edinburgh towards my fines, I cannot support your apology for delay, as it was quite unnecessary, considering what I have received from that City. You had previously remitted the fiftieth part of my fines; London and its vicinity have already contributed a fifth, Manchester near a thirtieth, and Leeds about a fortieth; so that, you see, if some few more of the populous towns had been as forward as you have been, the persecuting bigots who have been scheming to imprison me for life would have been defeated even before now; and that they will be so defeated before Christmas I am quite confident at present. Be so good to pay my respects, and return my thanks to my Christian friend, and tell him that he only abhors my opinions because he has taken them from report and not from examination. I have not a doubt but that he too would renounce Christianity if he was well acquainted with its origin and history and with all the train of miseries it has brought upon that portion of mankind who have been exposed to its influence. He is only a Christian from education and habit, and would have been equally as moral and humane a man if he had been a Hindoo, a Jew or a Turk. His humanity is the result of his organization and not of his religion. Religion never improves the temper but often makes it worse, although it may restrain it at certain times and on certain occasions.

If our Christian friend knew, that, the opinions and principles we avow are they alone that are calculated to prevent wars among mankind; if he knew that it is they alone that are calculated to prevent famines, such as that now existing in Ireland, in the midst of plenty, by leaving to man the fruits of his industry and by not robbing the industrious man of his all to pamper the idle Priest and Aristocrat; if he knew that all morality must have its foundation upon natural laws, that it has no relation to religion, and that all our opinions and principles, are founded upon those laws and that alone upon the principle of doing as we wish to be done unto, then I think he would no longer boast of being a Christian, but become ashamed of it, and acknowledge that his every moral principle was akin to the opinions of

Richard Carlile, which he now imagines that he abhors. All morality must have the same foundation: it is one and the same thing with the whole of the human race: whilst religion is as variable as the human features. Let our friend muster courage to be mentally honest to himself; let him read, first, Paine's *Age of Reason*, then Mirabaud's *System of Nature*; and then let him say how far he abhors the opinions and principles I hold and advocate.

Of all the Mythologies and Idolatries that ever disgraced mankind, the Christian is the most contemptible, the most ill founded, and that which can be least defended or excused. The idea of one immortal God putting another immortal God to death for their mutual satisfaction, is such an incongruous idea, as to be of itself enough to settle the value of the Christian Religion. But when we are told that the one immortal God over shadowed a virgin for the purpose of begetting another immortal God, that had existed from all eternity, and that this act sent this immortal God through all the stages of humanity, to live in poverty and hunger, to enjoy none of the comforts which the human race generally provide for themselves, and, lastly, to die the death of the worst of criminals; when we arrange and consider all these ideas, or the whole of this fable, what else can we feel but contempt for the tale, and pity for those who are duped and blinded by it. There is something so derogatory to all our ideas of Deity, there is something so tyrant and villain-like throughout this tale, that morality itself forbids us to believe it, and proclaims it an outrage upon nature and humanity and all natural and humane ideas of Deity. To say nothing of the obscenity and incontinency of the begetting, and birth of Jesus; to say nothing of his actions, such as turning water into wine for men already drunk, destroying the swine, stealing the colt, and frequently hiding himself from those who were in pursuit of him; there is quite enough in all our ideas of Deity to reject this horrible, this fabulous story, and to pronounce it the very worst and most ill founded specimen of Mythology that ever had existence in the mind of man. To protect such a gross idolatry in the present age and to persecute men for not adhering to it, must be the summit of villainy and wickedness; because no intelligent, disinterested and enquiring mind can possibly believe any thing of the kind as founded in truth. Where is the Priest or the supporter of the Christian Religion who will meet me in defence of his idolatry. Even Dr. England, the Archdeacon of Dorset, has been silent ever since I invited him to a confer-

ence upon the subject; although, he ventured to question the propriety of my opinions before he found I was disposed to meet him fairly, and even upon his own dunghill!

The Christian Religion has not only the immoralities above mentioned connected with it, but it is the portrait of injustice throughout. It damns every human being that ever lived and knew nothing of it, even if there were no means of acquiring a knowledge of it, or before it existed. Both in profession and practice it creates all kinds of dissensions in families and in nations, the members of which inevitably happen to disagree about its ill-defined dogmas. The act of putting Jesus to death, even if true, was an act of injustice, as the alleged object must have been practicable according to the common notions of Deity without any such outrage upon humanity. If Jehovah had more power than Jesus, his dooming him so to die upon so shallow a pretence was an act of injustice, and such was the begetting him upon a woman betrothed to another Jew. The whole thing, in and throughout, teaches us nothing but acts of immorality, injustice and tyranny; and such has been the practice of those who adhere to its doctrines from the time of Constantine the first Christian Roman Emperor down to the present time, wherever it has been a state religion.

Let our Christian friend read and reflect on those assertions: let him refer to Gibbon's Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire as an authority for them: let him then read such volumes as are avowedly written for the true exposure of Christianity and all other Idolatries; and if I do not much mistake the portrait I have drawn of the man in my mind, his abhorrence will be turned from mine to some of his own present and past opinions. I shall hope to hear that he has read what I now write to you, and will freely give him room in the Republican to discuss mine and to defend his own opinions, if he fears not discussion upon this, both to him and me, important matter.

To all friends in Edinburgh I pay my respects, and return them thanks for their continued support. I hope to afford them the satisfaction of witnessing the good effects of that support; for I am vain enough to think that I increase in strength amidst all the persecutions heaped upon me; and I defy the Christians to do as much again towards ruining me in property and checking my career as they have hitherto done.

I am, Sir, sincerely yours,

R. CARLILE.

TO MR. R. CARLILE, DORCHESTER GAOL.

DEAR SIR,

Liverpool, May 31, 1822.

SOME time since I remitted you through the hands of a friend, a trifle raised by a few friends here towards defraying your fine, we are going on with our subscriptions, and I hope in a short time to be able to send you something more. My object in writing is to induce you to publish at length those parts of the Bible which are referred to in the sheet published, entitled "The Beauties of the Bible." I should wish it to be done in as cheap a form as possible, say three pence; myself and friend will take fifty copies, and I have no doubt you might realize something by the sale of them; I would have them sealed up, and addressed to the fathers of families. You must not suppose that I am wishing to disseminate such immoral trash from immoral motives, my object is to lay bare the deformity which lies hidden beneath the cloak of revelation. The Vice Society take especial care to suppress immoral caricatures and pamphlets, at the same time that they are sending abroad the vilest bestiality and filth in the name of God! If you print them, it is my intention to send one to every Christian father of a family with whom I am acquainted. I will, if you think proper, write and transmit you a preface or apology for printing the bawdy part of God's word.

Yours, sincerely,

A LOVER OF TRUTH.

A Lover of Truth is informed, that the publication he mentions has been in consideration and determined on for some time past; but I have so many pamphlets waiting for the Press, both as prints and reprints, that it must be delayed. There are now out of print and waiting their turns, the "Address to Men of Science;" "The Scripturians's Creed;" "Report of the Trial of Mrs. Carlile" several numbers of "The Republican" necessary to complete sets, besides the Reports of the Trials of the Men in Giltspur Street Compter, that have not yet appeared. "The Report of the Trial of Humphrey Boyle" will be the first to appear, and as early as possible, and this Report will embrace all those obscene parts of the Bible he read in Court, when the women and boys were ordered out! after those have appeared I shall judge of the propriety of making a complete collection of the obscene beauties of the Bible, as a beacon to parents. It may not be amiss for the Lover of Truth to forward his preface.

Dorchester Gaol, June 16, 1822.

R. CARLILE.

P. S. The letter dated the 31st of May, did not reach Dorchester Gaol, until the 14th instant.

TO MR. R. CARLILE.

SIR,

THE following lines were written by a friend of mine five or six years ago, and only had a private circulation, but are so applicable to the present state of Society, that if you will give them insertion in your Republican, you will much oblige a constant reader from its commencement, or if you cannot a notice to that effect.

Yours,

J. S.

ON THE DECLARATION OF THE ALLIES, IN 1815,

GUARANTEEING AGAINST REVOLUTIONS, &c.

"PEACE upon Earth!"—From Danube's wat'ry bound,
Borne on the voice of monarchs came the sound!

Wide thro' the world the kingly chorus ran—

"PEACE upon Earth, and servitude to man:"

Ambition, Discord, Hate, at last agree—

Peace among despots—War with Liberty!

PEACE!—Ye blaspheme, and take her name in vain;

Peace shall be none on Earth while tyrants reign.

Insulted Reason scorns the hollow breath—

Your Peace is slavery, and your rest is death!

Nature's dearest gifts in your accursed hands

Are turned to poisons, and corrupts the lands—

Her plagues to blessings—Tumults, Slaughters, Swords,

REVOLTS, REBELLIONS—these are holy words—

These, evermore, with Furies arm'd and fears,

Shall shake your thrones, and thunder in your ears—

Peace to the Free—Deliverance to the Slave—

And war with Tyrants to the very Grave.

TO MR. R. CARLILE, DORCHESTER GAOL.

SIR,

No. 1, Scott Place, Bird Cage Walk, Hackney Road.
FROM my superior knowledge of Natural Philosophy above any now taught, I hope you will not be offended at the liberty, I take, by trespassing on your time at such an important moment as the present, with my opinion on the subject of Deity.

Every one who pretends to, or does know any thing of philosophy,

ought also to know matter is so very essential to every animated being, that nothing can exist any where without it; whether natural or supernatural. They ought also to know (for sufficient are the proofs in nature) that animation cannot exist in one particle of matter only; for it cannot admit of any motion of its parts because it has none; nor can it admit of any internal motion, for it is solid. Therefore it is an undeniable truth, no being whatever having life whether natural or supernatural, can exist any otherwise than in plurality of particles united together by the cause of cohesion, (commonly called attraction of cohesion. Now because matter is so very essential to every animated being that nothing can exist without it: and cohesion is equally essential. No animated being, such as we can in any ways suppose to exist, could have existed previous to those two most essential things. Likewise, animation does not exist in those two things only, but in the motion of some internal fluid matter within the substance of the being. Therefore matter, cohesion, and motion, must have existed before any animated being; consequently they must have existed before God. Hence it is obvious, whatever beings exist superior to man they must still be subordinate to nature. We know the power of man, and in the anatomy of him we find no part superfluous, nor in the chemical analysis of him do we find any part, without which would render man superior in power, invisible to sight, and insensible to touch, more than in his natural state. How then can we affirm by nature the existence of being all-powerful, invisible, insensible to touch, and able to penetrate through the most solid substances of walls, &c. without any displacement of those substances or injury to themselves, when all nature denies it? I want no man to refrain from his religious motive for my opinions, I know it is considered part of the law of the land; but the cultivation of good morals free of superstition would be far better to produce pleasure to one's-self and happiness to all.

I am, Sir, your obedient Servant,

E. BUSH.

TO MR. R. CARLILE, DORCHESTER GAOL.

RESPECTED CITIZEN, Chester Castle, June 19, 1822.

YOUR kind letter containing the award of Ten Pounds, came duly to hand, and which sum I have received according to your order. I have also to acknowledge the receipt of One Pound from the Republicans of Leeds, about the 19th of May last, for both of which I return my sincere thanks, and as there has never gone a regular statement of my case from me, you shall have one in a short time. I could wish to know why we should be treated worse than the debtors, but I suppose I might as well ask, of what use are Bishops to the

people; or, why one Parson is allowed the benefits of two Churches, and employ a man to do the duty of one of them, at about one-third of its benefit. I believe Parsons to be the greatest tyrants upon earth, and the supporters of the worst of villainy. If you can explain these few questions you will much oblige,

Your most sincere, and grateful Citizen,
JOSEPH SWANN.

N. B. Since the arrival of your letter, Mr. Harrison has received Ten Pounds from Mr. Hunt to be divided between us, and we have likewise received several pounds from different places, but cannot give you the names at present, but they will appear in the "Black Dwarf."

TO MR. CARLILE, DORCHESTER GAOL.

SIR,

Norwich, June 30, 1822.

I INCLOSE you Three Pounds, being a contribution from the Friends to Parliamentary Reform, meeting at the Town House Tavern in this city. I beg leave to add that I have contributed to this subscription, not from any approbation of your attacks upon revealed Religion, but because I wish as a Christian to do that which I believe my great Teacher would have done, to bear my decided testimony against the interference of the magistrate in matters which concern a man's own conscience only.

I am, Sir, your sincere well wisher,
EDWARD TAYLOR.

TO MR. EDWARD TAYLOR, NORWICH.

SIR,

Dorchester Gaol, July 2, 1822.

I RETURN thanks for the contribution of Three Pounds transmitted by you from the Friends to Parliamentary Reform who meet at the Town House Tavern in the city of Norwich. I can both believe and respect the motive for your individual contribution, as it would be a lamentable state of society indeed, if there were no exceptions to the general variance in the professions and practices of those who call themselves Christians. On the other hand, I beg leave to say, that, I am as earnestly and sincerely attached to and equally impressed with the superior importance of those principles I advocate, as any Christian can feel towards the principles of Christianity. I ask nothing but unrestrained discussion, as in my humble opinion, the *sum-mum bonum* for mankind.

I am, Sir, gratefully yours,
R. CARLILE.

TO THE CHRISTIAN JUDGE BAILEY.

LETTER IX.

AMIDST all my acquaintance, to none do I offer so little ceremony as in my correspondence with you. Two months have elapsed since I last addressed you, whilst I find myself still a prisoner for the preservation of the Christian Religion, and you, I presume, are making preparations for your summer's journey to York, and rehearsing a new oration against sedition and blasphemy, then and there to be spoken, in which something must be said about the blessings and the refreshing dews which fall from taxation, and a government debt that loses itself in figures. I beg pardon, Mr. Cobbett puts them together as simply a figure of eight and eight ciphers, and, like another Alexander, proposes to get rid of the Gordian knot by cutting it. He sagaciously observes that it is only necessary to cut off a mere cipher to ensure a greater conquest than ever Alexander made. It would conquer the tyrants who depress us, and conquer not only a lasting peace to the people of this Island, but real prosperity for the future, in the establishment of a Representative System of Government. Mr. Cobbett, I presume, wishes to preserve an acknowledgment of the debt of eighty millions for the relief of those who have embarked the savings of industry and their little all in it; to this, as an individual, I would readily accede, and can then see how the property of what is called the Church, may be made to settle the whole matter easy enough. I particularly recommend to your notice, Mr. Justice Bailey, a pamphlet published by Wilson at the Exchange, upon the subject of Church Property, and the spoliation of property by the Priests in this country. You will there see that the Priests of England, Wales, and Ireland, have a larger income as a whole than all the Christian Priests on the face of the earth out of those two Islands.

My neglect in addressing you has arisen from the pressure of matter to fill the pages of "The Republican," and from no other cause. I must keep you as an auxiliary for that purpose, when there be a deficiency of other matter, though I have no wish to be compelled to throw your Prayer Book among other lumber, there to lie untouched for two months together again, until I have done with it.

Vol. VI. No. 6.

In concluding my last, I took notice of the case of Robert Wedderburn, who had suffered two years imprisonment in this Gaol, at your instance, *for having spoken unpolitely of some ancient Jews*. I am happy to inform you that the recognizances under which you had placed him did not detain him in the Gaol above three days, and that I understand, from mere accident. When he ceased to be a Prisoner he was allowed to see and converse with me; and I am further happy to inform you that he foiled all the arts, intrigues, and delusions of the Parson-Justices, aided by Wilberforce, to make him a Christian; whilst Wedderburn himself convinced many, whom he could converse with, of the indefensible character of the Christian Religion and its parent the Old Testament. In describing his treatment I found by personal enquiry that I had kept much within the mark; and that the conduct of the magistrates towards him on his first coming to the Gaol was infamous in the extreme. In the close and foul cell in which they first placed him he was told that he was to fill out his two years without fire; and it was not until after much reasoning and remonstrance that the placing him in a cell with a small fire-place was yielded as a matter of favour and Christian humanity! He assured me that so horrible did the idea impress his mind of being shut up in a cell two winters without a fire, after having been so many years accustomed to very warm and overheated work-shops, that he entertained serious ideas of defeating the threatened misery by ending his life! However, I am glad to say he has left the prison alive and in good spirits, and has returned to London, where I have lost him in the crowd; but I sincerely hope, that when you are brought to the bar of justice, if it be possible ever to bring you there, that Mr. Wedderburn will be living to be a witness against you, and to detail the treatment he has received at your instance.

The last subject in your Prayer Book, that came under notice, was the Athanasian Creed: the next in order is the Litany, which is rather a subject for ridicule than for condemnation. The Christian Idols are delineated to the very essence in its commencement. "*O God the Father of Heaven; O God the Son, Redeemer of the world; O God the Holy Ghost, proceeding from the Father and the Son; O holy, blessed, and glorious Trinity, three Persons and one God.*" There is one observation worthy of being made here, and that is, that there has been for centuries a strange dispute between the Greek and the Latin Church as to whe-

ther the Holy Ghost proceeded from the Father or the Son, or from both. The Greeks insist that the Holy Ghost proceeded from the Father alone, and the Latins at first were as positive that it was from the Son, whilst, after many bloody battles and direful dissensions, a sort of compromise took place, and the Holy Ghost was tacitly allowed to have proceeded from both, though like all other sectarians the Greeks still hold to their original tenet, which now makes the chief distinction between what are called the tenets of the Greeks and the Roman Catholics. It is high time the whole of this bugbear was put down, and it is evidently becoming a wreck from Constantinople to Lisbon. It is still much to be lamented that this gross idolatry as a whole is not attacked by the joint force of all the philosophers of Europe. They have the power at this moment of bringing it to a speedy extinction. It is not even met with the same spirit now as it was in the last century; whilst the force of attack ought to have increased with the declining power of the idolatry. There is yet existing a disgraceful mental slavery among the men denominated philosophers, to which the ancient philosophers of Greece and of Rome were utter strangers, and by which they were untainted. Theirs was the noble freedom to speak what they thought: and ours the infamous degraded slavery to speak and act contrary to our inclinations, and what we think and know to be morally right and true. This conduct is visible throughout all our institutions; but in no place more so than in the Parliament, the greater portion of the Press, and what are called our philosophical institutions.

It can be scarcely considered short of a tedious repetition for me to say any thing more upon the subject of this Trinity in Unity; for the whole thing is such a burlesque upon language and figures as to be almost unworthy of notice upon paper. How the one can proceed from the other and be still one and co-eternal is a mystery which pious Christians can have no desire to solve or to enquire into, and which Anti-Christians deem impossible. As well might I say that my present frame is eternal because the matter that composes it has existed from all eternity.

As a proof of the inefficacy of all the prayers of Christians I have need but to notice one in this Litany. "*That it may please thee to endue the Lords of the Council, and all the Nobility, with grace, wisdom, and understanding.*" This may be called a prayer for the Aristocracy in general; and I am sure it has never been answered; for among none

in this country is there less grace, wisdom, and understanding found than among the Aristocracy, or the falsely stiled Nobles.

There is nothing worth notice in any other part of the Litany, and you, Sir, have not furnished any notes but one to tell us that your immortal God, who died on the tree, was a very great coward and no philosopher, and that at the thought of death he fell into an agony and bloody sweat and begged hard to have his life spared. How unlike the conduct of Socrates, or of others in our day who have been sacrificed as martyrs in the attempt to ameliorate the condition of mankind, or of their countrymen in particular! How unlike the Republican heroes of France who have been sacrificed to the base and bigotted passions of the Bourbons! The brave Berthon I am sorry to see is in their hands, but I guarantee his conduct at the scaffold, if there be no means of rescuing him, as far superior to that of the fabled Reformer of the Jews.

The next subject in this Book of Common Prayer is a series of prayers and thanksgivings for various purposes. The first is a prayer for rain, the second for fine weather, and in another part, there are thanksgivings as acknowledgments of having received what have been prayed for. To those who are capable of praying at all, such subjects may not seem improper; but the man who has once discovered, that prayer is a useless, injurious act and a mental deception, has most likely discovered that rain and fair weather are physical causes under the controul of no God, but the results of a combination of circumstances in the atmosphere, motion, and solar, and lunar positions of our planet. When a man once knows this he will then discover the inutility of prayer for any such object or for any other object.

The next is a prayer "in the time of dearth and famine," to which there is also a set off as a thanksgiving for plenty. To suit the present state of the Irish nation this prayer and thanksgiving should be altered, or joined together; as we now see a famine of the worst description in the midst of plenty, and even the Archbishop of Tuam and other Priests attribute this circumstance to the just afflictions inflicted upon them for their sins by their God or Gods! This is making the Christian Trinity a *tantalizer* indeed, and putting in practice, upon the murdered and dying Irish, the fate of Tantalus with a vengeance. How much better would it have been for every Irish man, woman, and child, who have died or are likely to die in this state of famine surrounded

with plenty, to have died in a struggle for their liberties and a natural and lawful possession of their share of this plenty? Had I the wealth of Cræsus, I would not contribute a mite to keep them upon the present scheme, where those who first rob them without mercy are employed to distribute the contributions of charity to save them alive, nor unless they would raise to a man in an attempt to assert their rights as human beings. Every being of them should have been arrayed under the banner of Captain Rock last winter and there would have been no starvation among them at this time.

But what are we to think Mr. Justice Bailey of you and your fellow Christians making your Deity the author of every horrible trick of this kind? Has not this something of the appearance of what you call blasphemy? When you make your God the author of dearth and famine, war and tumults, plague and sickness and every other evil that can befall mankind, and pretend that it is done on account of our sins, or your sins as Christians, for I will not admit myself to be a sinner, nor degrade myself by any such hypocritical prostration in acknowledging what I do not mean or feel, what reasonable man would wish to partake of your religion so as to be continually jealous of his God and be as continually fancying that his God is as jealous of him. Such is a shocking religion and opposed to every idea of morality or humanity; a fact borne out by the following sentence in the following prayer, or a prayer for the Bishops: "*Almighty God, our heavenly Father, who hast purchased to thyself an universal Church by the precious blood of thy dear Son;*" A God purchasing a Church to himself, in opposition to some other God, by the blood of his Son! This is the literal meaning of the sentence. To purchase a Church, the price of which was the blood of a Son. Is it any wonder that such poor distressed fanatics as Mrs. Mountford should sever the head of a beloved infant when such horrid words are incessantly dinned upon their weak minds. Among the early Christians it was deemed meritorious to sacrifice an infant at some of their love feasts, and actually feed upon its quivering limbs, doubtless, an horrid act and notion engendered upon the example which it was pretended their God had set them. Mr. Gibbon has slightly alluded to this circumstance, but his humanity forbade him to believe it. Yet we are to be told that this is religion of love, of peace, and goodwill among mankind. It is really the reverse. It is the religion of vice, cruelty and humanity.

In this last mentioned prayer Jehovah is begged to make choice of fit persons for the ministry of his Church and not allow the Bishops to lay hands on any man suddenly. What a mockery is this when it is notorious that every place of profit in the Church is either obtained by purchase or by political interest, intrigues and corruption, and that the Bishop and expectant Bishops are the most corrupt of all political intriguers.

Another proof of the inefficacy of prayer is to be found in that which is used during the session of Parliament, wherein it is prayed, "*that peace and happiness, truth and justice*" may be the result of all its endeavours. This we know, *to our sorrow*, has never been the case, but that these four essentials to the moral welfare of the people have been incessantly violated.

Prayers we know are daily put up in both Houses of Parliament to the same effect, in which wisdom is prayed for to guide the members aright in all their deliberations; but if religion be to be considered a solemnity, what a dreadful mockery must such a practice be with the members of such Parliaments as have infested England for a century past? What sort of a deliberation is there in Castle-reagh's bell that rings in the members to vote when they have not heard a word upon the subject, and when this only object is to be sure on which side the minister is voting? What direful hypocrisy does not this pretended religion encourage! And who violate all its professions so much as those who are sworn and paid to observe and protect them.

I have now made all the extracts I intend to make from this article of prayers and thankgivings. Believing as I now do that there is no God distinct from the great whole of matter and its beautifully varied motions and effects, or in plainer words, no intelligent or designing Creator, as superstition teaches, you may imagine that the generality of subjects in your book are beneath my notice, and that I cannot comment upon them in that elaborate manner which is common among sectarians with each other's doctrines. It is continually recurring to my mind, that, every point of objection to the contents of your book is settled upon the principle, that, there is no such a God as you worship and profess to believe; and unless you can demonstrate the contrary, you have no foundation for any system you build upon it. I will not press you to the proof of the existence of the Son or the Holy Ghost; prove the existence of the Father and I will be satisfied.

No man ought to pray before he knows what he prays to, and whether the object he prays to be capable of granting what is prayed for. This appears to be but a common sense maxim; but how opposite is the conduct of all Idolators? They pray to they know not what, and often for they know not what; in fact they consider it the chief business of life, where fanaticism exists without hypocrisy. The Mahometans consider themselves as lost beings if they neglect to pray at stated hours, though it be in the midst of a battle, a feast, a revel, or a debauch. The Methodists consider prayer useless unless they pray with the spirit and groan and make hideous noises, whilst the prayers of all old established churches are mere matters of ceremony, form, and official routine, and in most cases it forms the common trade of the Priest of every sect. One sect of fanatics considers it necessary to pray away their own sins, whilst another is content to buy the prayers of the Priest for that purpose, and the whole is evidently a gross delusion upon mankind, and the result of gross ignorance. Let man first discover to what he prays, and whether his idol can give him what he asks, before he attempts to argue for the necessity of the practice of prayer. I can proudly say that I PRAY NOT AT ALL and that I SWEAR NOT AT ALL; nor will I, until I discover some organized being superior to man in the universe with whom prayer and swearing may be availing and noticed. Prayer is the act of a succumbing slave, in the common acceptation of the word, and among mankind may be considered a general crying evil that tends to keep up unjust and unnatural distinctions. Swearing is an immoral vicious habit and an emblem of bad passions. I have heard Priests and their dupes say that the man who prays not at all resembles the brute beasts, but I say nay; every time a man prays to an idol or to his fellow man he makes himself less than a man or a brute beast either. The prayer of Cain at the altar in Lord Byron's work of that title, is a beautiful specimen, and a masterly burlesque upon the common cant which passes under that designation.

I must now Mr. Justice Bailey take my leave of you until I hear of your return from the Northern Circuit. I have often wished you would have come this western circuit once during my residence in this Gaol, as I should certainly have ventured to invite you to a spiritual repast with me, to a cold collation of physics and metaphysics, the first and foremost dish to have been the Trinity in Unity and the Unity

in Trinity garnished with the sentences of the Athanasian Creed.

I give you joy of your avowed connection with and patronage of the John Bull newspaper and its ostensible managers.

R. CARLILE.

Dorchester Gaol, July 2, Year 1822,
of the Christian Mythology.

THE KING AGAINST JANE AND MARY ANN CARLILE.

The following Affidavit presented to the Court of King's Bench by Mr. Evans, on behalf of Mrs. and Mary Ann Carlile, on which a motion for a Rule to shew Cause was refused.

JANE and Mary Ann Carlile late of London, Booksellers, now Prisoners in his Majesty's Gaol of Dorchester, severally make oath and say :

That the treatment they receive in this Gaol is to the injury of their health, and an exception to the general rules observed towards other Prisoners, in regard to the nature of their confinement: that whilst convicted felons are unlocked from their cells from six o'clock in the morning until eight o'clock at night, and throughout that time allowed to walk in very airy and salubrious yards, and to breathe among flowers, fruits, and vegetables, Deponents are locked up twenty-two hours out of every twenty-four, being allowed to walk out but two hours each day, which they have found inefficient for the preservation of their health, the weather and other circumstances frequently preventing them from walking out at the hours appointed; as prior to the present week, or until an intimation was given to the Authorities of the Gaol, that this application would be made to this Honourable Court, Deponents were obliged to walk at an appointed hour, or when it suited the convenience of some person set as a watch and a guard over them, to walk after them throughout the time they were unlocked.

And the aforesaid Jane Carlile deposeth, that on coming to this Gaol, in the month of February of last year, she was placed in the same ward with her husband, whom she found,

at that period, never to have been in the open air for twelve months, he refusing to be led out and in at an appointed time, but for one hour each day, which she has been informed and believes, was double the time first appointed, an entry being made on the Magistrates' Order Book, that he was to walk under the superintendence of a Turnkey, but half an hour each day, or one hour each alternate day. That she brought to this Gaol with her an infant of fourteen months old, and no kind of offer was made to her that she might walk out into the air, or that she might send out her infant, save, that she understood, as her husband might have walked one hour each day, she might have done the same with her infant, but so objectionable did the terms seem that she refused with her husband to accept them, and after being locked up in one room about six weeks her infant was brought to the point of death, after which the surgeon made application to the visiting Magistrates, and Deponent was allowed to employ a nurse to carry her infant beyond the walls of the Gaol and to walk two hours in each day herself when the weather would permit, which measure alone she verily believes saved the life of her infant and with it her own.

This Deponent further states, that during her imprisonment, she has again borne a child, of which she was delivered on the fourth day of this month of June, and that she has suffered most severely from pains and sickness during her pregnancy, which she attributes solely to the close nature of her confinement, as heretofore she was always in better health than usual, during the gestation of four other children, and she now fears, that, unless she be allowed to walk freely in the open air in the day-time, as all other prisoners do, she shall not be able to preserve either her own health or that of her infant in its present state. And this Deponent further states, that, her husband has made application to the authorities of the Gaol, by letter to the Keeper, intimating the intention of a complaint to this Honourable Court and the grounds upon which it would be made, to see if they would supersede its necessity, by granting the just and necessary object for which the interference of this Honourable Court is now sought, but that those authorities have granted nothing further than that these Deponents may choose any two hours of the day to walk in the open air that they prefer so that they are followed by a Turnkey as before.

And the aforesaid Mary Ann Carlile deposeth, that throughout the period she has been confined, she has been

treated by the Authorities of the Gaol worse than a convicted felon is treated, in point of severity of confinement, and as far as the means of preserving health are in question, that throughout two of the winter months of the present year, she had to sleep in a cell where both winds and rain could beat upon her unless a rug or some other thing was nailed against the window, and where she was locked up from five o'clock in the evening until nine the next morning, and though female prisoners who slept in adjoining cells were unlocked at seven, and that then she was unlocked but to be moved to her brother's ward, in which there was a continual fire by day and three persons sleeping by night, and the door of which being always locked at that time prevented its being ever purified by a current of air. That this very close confinement has greatly impaired her health, and subjected her to a variety of pains which she never felt before, and that she attributes this treatment entirely to the prejudices of the Authorities of the Gaol, as the general health of the Prisoners is good, and the whole Prison a clean, most commodious, and most healthy place. And she further deposes, that she dreads the decline of summer and the approach of the winter months if she be not put upon the same footing as every other female prisoner, and obtain a free admission to the open air in the day-time.

And Deponents further say, That they cannot see any moral obstacle to the common right they now seek, nor any thing inconsistent with the good order of the Gaol; they therefore pray this Honourable Court to grant its Rule, calling upon the Authorities of His Majesty's Gaol of Dorchester to shew cause why these Deponents should not have the same liberty of walking in the open air throughout the day-time as is enjoyed by every other prisoner in the Gaol, excepting where the sentence be close and solitary confinement.

JANE CARLILE.

MARY ANN CARLILE.

In answer to this application, the Chief Justice observed, That he did not know any authority the Court possessed to interfere in this matter, and requested Mr. Evans to look into the authorities for that object. It happened to be the wrong side of the question for the Common Law to interfere. Mr. Justice Holroyd said, such treatment may be proper, if the prisoners pursued any particular line of conduct. The *Old Washerwoman* should have first enquired

whether they did or did not pursue any particular line of conduct. They have had no opportunity to pursue but one line of conduct, for their treatment has been uniform, and ordered on their first coming to the Gaol.

When Mr. Hunt first applied to the Court for a writ of *Habeas Corpus* that he might be enabled to lay his grievances in person before the Court; the Court were unwilling to put him to the expence of a removal from the prison to which he must again be remanded, but they would grant him a Rule calling upon the under Sheriff of the county of Somerset, and the Keeper of the Gaol of Ilchester, to shew cause, why he, Mr. Hunt, should not be treated as all other persons were treated who were confined in the same Gaol for misdemeanour. It was upon the strength of this precedent that the females in question made their application; little expecting that what was *common law* to Mr. Hunt in 1820, was not to be *common law* to them in 1822.

One of the Judges observed, that they could not interfere because no case of cruelty or oppression was shewn. If the foregoing affidavit does not detail both cruelty and oppression; it is difficult to conceive what would constitute those terms in the minds of such men as fill the Bench in that Court. There are monsters to whom cruelty and oppression afford delight; there are those who feel extatic delight at the appalling music of human groans, and who like Nero would fiddle amidst a general devastation. Castlereagh and his men perceived no cruelty in the floggings that reached the bowels, and in the half-hangings, and the burnings that were practised in Ireland at the close of the last century; they can perceive no cruelty in the measures that have produced a famine in Ireland in the midst of a general plenty; they can perceive no cruelty in the massacre at Manchester, nor in the indiscriminate massacre of their fellow Christians by the Turks; from such men it was too much to be expected that any cruelty or oppression should be discovered in the treatment of two females as detailed in the foregoing affidavit. Judge Jefferies and his patrons discovered no cruelty in his measures; but, there came those who did discover such cruelties, and who retaliated justly for them; and there may come a day when it will be discovered that cruelties have been exercised by Castlereagh and Company; and that the present Judges of the Court of King's Bench have participated in the infliction of those cruelties. It may then be discovered, that to shut two females up in one room

twenty-two hours out of every twenty-four constitutes both cruelty and oppression.

R. CARLILE.

TO COUNTRY AGENTS.

THE new arrangements made by Mr. Cobbett for the publication of his Register (not exactly just and liberal to those who took upon them both the pecuniary and penal risk of its publication during his absence in America) has disordered our country connection in many instances, particularly as it relates to charges. To those who had to pay carriage for parcels, our charges were eightpence in the shilling of the retail price, but as many persons are compelled to have more parcels than one, in consequence of Mr. Cobbett monopolizing the wholesale publication of his Register, and refusing to do as others have done for him, or to take orders for any goods but of his own publishing, and as they very naturally wish to have this division of parcels come as one to save expence, and leave them at least secure against loss, it becomes necessary to arrange, that wherever the parcel comes regularly through that of Mr. Cobbett's, we must charge his prices, as we share his expence for carriage; but wherever we can either alone, or in combination with other persons, make up a parcel, for which we have nothing to pay as carriage, our charges will remain unaltered. It is further necessary and due to ourselves to be observed, that we have no prejudices against the publications of any person, and that we take orders for all, and supply all as ordered, but we cannot obtain Mr. Cobbett's Register to send off on Friday with our own parcels. Mr. Hunt and Mr. Dolby seem to think that Mr. Cobbett's new arrangement is levelled exclusively at his Mr. H.'s Memoirs, but this is not the fact, as we find the same trouble, complaint, and loss, and perhaps in a greater degree, as we pub-

lish weekly, and on the same day with Mr. Cobbett, which is not the case of the other.

We freely supply orders for publications of every kind; but it is absolutely necessary, that where a parcel has to leave London on the Friday, the order should be received on the Thursday Morning.

THE PUBLISHERS OF THE REPUBLICAN.

The REPORTS of the TRIALS of HUMPHREY BOYLE and JOSEPH RHODES, are now published in one Pamphlet. Price 1s.

The KORAN and LAWRENCE'S LECTURES have been rather delayed and interrupted, but we hope to proceed regularly, and with rapidity, after a week or two. The Koran will not exceed Twenty Sheets, and Lawrence's Lectures will reach to between Thirty and Forty.

TO CORRESPONDENTS.

To E. I. of Epsom we return thanks, but cannot act upon his suggestion in the present year. Our Press is clogged with having so many things in hand already. The existing publications are sufficient for every thing we have in view, if we had the same treasury to dip into as the circulators of lying religious tracts have, and if we could only meet them fairly in every house. Fanatics deem it a charity to circulate their tracts gratuitously, whilst most of the disciples of Paine and Mirabaud consider they do enough to provide for themselves such publications as they approve. We have nothing like a system of proselytism in our ranks as yet, beyond what public discussion produces. Every advocate of our principles seems conscious that they require

no intrigue to propagate them, and acts accordingly, whilst the whole system of our opponents, resting upon nothing but deception and intrigue, is and must be supported by a corresponding machinery. We shall be glad to hear from E. I. if there be any difficulty in obtaining "The Republican," in his neighbourhood, and we ask the assistance of all friends to facilitate its circulation.

SUBSCRIPTION FOR MR. R. CARLILE.

	£. s. d.
From W. L. in addition to a former Subscription	2 0 0

For the Four Men in Giltspur Street.

From W. L. £1. each as per Names	4 0 0
--	-------

W. V. HOLMES.
J. BARKLEY.
JOSEPH RHODES.
H. BOYLE.

Printed and Published by R. CARLILE, 55, Fleet Street. All Communications (post paid) are requested to be sent to Dorchester Gaol, until a further Address to some House or Shop be given.—Orders, with remittances, or references for payment, will be punctually attended to. Country Agents will find the most liberal Terms for prompt Payment.